

STATE PERFORMANCE PLAN / ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART C

for STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act

**For reporting on
FFY 2020**

Missouri



**PART C DUE
February 1, 2022**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

Introduction

Instructions

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State's systems designed to drive improved results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families and to ensure that the Lead Agency (LA) meets the requirements of Part C of the IDEA. This introduction must include descriptions of the State's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

Intro - Indicator Data

Executive Summary

Missouri Part C Infrastructure

The Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) is the lead State agency responsible for implementing Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Missouri's early intervention system, known as First Steps, is comprised of: (A) regional System Point of Entry offices; (B) a Central Finance Office; and (C) early intervention providers.

A. Regional System Point of Entry Offices: The State is divided into ten early intervention regions. The State of Missouri contracts with an entity that serves as the System Point of Entry (SPOE) in each of the ten regions. The SPOEs are responsible for the local administration of the program, including referral, intake, eligibility determination and Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) development. All service coordination activities are provided by the SPOE.

B. Central Finance Office: The State of Missouri also contracts with a Central Finance Office (CFO) whose responsibilities include: enrolling and paying providers; fiscal management; and conducting regular reviews of provider accounts to ensure providers continue to meet the criteria as qualified personnel, including completion of module training, a review of provider licensure, liability insurance and criminal history checks. The CFO also maintains the State's child data system. The CFO provides a support help desk to trouble-shoot problems with users, which helps DESE ensure accurate data are entered in the system.

C. Early Intervention Providers: Early intervention services are delivered by providers who meet DESE's qualifications. All providers enroll as individuals who are independent vendors or affiliated with an agency. SPOEs organize and coordinate providers into Early Intervention Teams (EIT). EIT is Missouri's service delivery model that involves transdisciplinary teams and a primary provider model. Each EIT must include at least one Service Coordinator, Physical Therapist, Occupational Therapist, Speech/Language Pathologist and Special Instructor. The number of teams per region is determined by the SPOE.

The EIT serves as the main source of providers for families in the Part C program. IFSP services are provided using a primary service provider approach where one professional from the team, or primary provider, is chosen by the IFSP team to serve as the main support to the family. Families requiring services from disciplines other than those represented on the EIT (i.e., ancillary providers) will receive those services from other disciplines enrolled with the CFO.

Lead Agency Staff

In the fall of 2021, Part C staff transitioned from the DESE - Office of Early Learning to the DESE - Office of Childhood (OOC) which was created via executive order of the Governor of the State of Missouri on January 28, 2021. The creation of this new office resulted in bringing together nearly all early childhood programs that were spread across three state agencies into one office. This new infrastructure changed the position titles of key state Part C staff with the Part C Coordinator now referred to as the Early Intervention Program Manager and Area Directors now referred to as Senior Program Specialists. Having nearly all early childhood programs in the State in the same office has supported the Part C program with more discussions about coordinated enrollment across programs, appropriate referrals to Part C, and the importance of developmental screening for all children. We expect to see improvements in efficiency and effectiveness at the program level and families and providers can expect to see improvements in access and receipt of services in the near future.

Early Intervention section staff in the OOC are responsible for implementing and monitoring the Part C program. The section consists of: (A) Program Manager; (B) Program Coordinator; (C) Senior Program Specialists; and, (D) Compliance staff.

A. Program Manager: serves as the Part C Coordinator and oversees the implementation of federal and state regulations, contractual obligations of the SPOEs and CFO, and coordinates with multiple State agencies including other sections at DESE.

B. Program Coordinator: responsible for the supervision of the four Senior Program Specialists, developing and maintaining program guidance, and coordinating requirements for monitoring with compliance staff.

C. Senior Program Specialists: There are four Senior Program Specialists located throughout the State. Each Senior Program Specialist provides training and technical assistance in the areas of child find, public awareness, SPOE operations, compliance requirements and best practices related to early intervention for two or three SPOE offices and early intervention providers.

D. Compliance Staff: There are two Compliance staff that conduct monthly provider monitoring, annual compliance monitoring of SPOE regions, document any findings of noncompliance and verify timely correction of all identified noncompliance. This staff is also responsible for investigating child complaints related to the Part C program.

WebSPOE Data System

DESE operates a secure, web-based child data system called WebSPOE. The system contains all elements of a child's record, including referral, evaluation, eligibility determination, and IFSP development and implementation. Data are entered in real-time and are accessible based on a user-level access in order to maintain privacy. The system is compliance driven and ensures compliance with regulations as well as best practice. SPOEs utilize the system to record child and family demographic information and enter authorizations for providers to deliver early intervention services. Providers utilize the system to record progress notes, submit claims for delivered early intervention services and review payment history.

Given the extent of data available in WebSPOE, the system has become an integral part of Missouri's general supervision system. Staff in the Early Intervention section utilize the system to conduct compliance monitoring and service monitoring activities.

Additional information related to data collection and reporting

Missouri Part C found the pandemic had no impact on the State's ability to collect and report data.

General Supervision System

The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part C requirements are met, e.g., monitoring systems, dispute resolution systems.

Compliance Monitoring Procedures

The ten SPOEs are monitored each year for compliance with State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) indicators. The monitoring data reported in this SPP/APR were obtained through desk reviews of individual child records in accordance with the State's compliance monitoring procedures. The desk reviews included information from both hard copy records and data in WebSPOE. At least one randomly selected record was reviewed from all Service Coordinators with a minimum of six months of First Steps experience.

During the 2020-21 monitoring, if the SPOE had 80% to 99% compliance on an indicator, then the SPOE had an opportunity to correct the instance prior to a finding being issued. Consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, both prongs had to be corrected: (1) the child level, with each individual case of noncompliance corrected, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the SPOE; and, (2) the SPOE level, with the SPOE providing documentation from new files, demonstrating compliance with the indicator. If the SPOE was able to demonstrate correction of both prongs prior to a finding being issued, then no finding was issued and no corrective action was required.

However, if the SPOE had 79% or less compliance on an indicator, then a finding was issued and a corrective action was required for that indicator. The SPOE did not have the opportunity to correct these instances prior to a finding being issued.

For all findings issued, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, both prongs of correction must be verified by Compliance staff in order to declare the SPOE 100% in compliance on the indicator: (1) at the child level, documentation that indicates the individual noncompliance has been corrected, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the SPOE; and, (2) at the SPOE level, documentation from new files, completed after the SPOE's corrective action plan was implemented, that indicates the SPOE is correctly implementing the regulations. All noncompliance, both at the individual child level and at the SPOE level, must be corrected as soon as possible, but no later than 12 months from the date the SPOE agency is notified of noncompliance.

Timely correction of noncompliance is ensured through the use of the web-based monitoring system, Improvement Monitoring Accountability and Compliance System (IMACS) and frequent contact with the SPOEs by Senior Program Specialist and other State staff. SPOEs are informed about the consequences for failure to correct noncompliance within 12 months. As outlined in the SPOE contractual requirements, any SPOE agency not willing or able to correct noncompliance within 12 months of receiving notification (timely correction) is subject to liquidated damages.

Service Monitoring Procedures

All early intervention services delivered in the Part C program are subject to Federal, State and local monitoring. As part of the provider agreement to deliver early intervention services and as part of the SPOE contract requirements, providers and SPOEs must participate in routine monitoring of the services delivered to families in early intervention. Providers are required to meet and maintain all standards, guidelines and policies for early intervention, including proper billing practices. Staff in the Early Intervention section conduct regular monitoring in order to verify providers are documenting and claiming services in accordance with State guidelines and instructions.

Examples of service monitoring procedures include a review of: the number of hours a day that providers billed for early intervention services; the number of missed visits; and complaints about provider billing practices. For each activity, staff in the Early Intervention section review claims and progress notes to verify there is sufficient documentation to substantiate payments to providers. Additional documentation to support the provider payment may be requested from the provider. Staff may provide technical assistance to a provider regarding recordkeeping and billing practices.

Dispute Resolution System

The Missouri Part C complaint system includes three options to resolve disputes: (A) child complaint; (B) due process hearing; and, (C) mediation.

A. Child Complaint: A child complaint may be filed by any person or organization who believes there has been a violation of any State or Federal regulation implementing Part C of the IDEA. The complaint must be filed in writing with DESE, Office of Childhood, unless it is determined the requirement to file in writing effectively denies the individual the right to file the complaint.

Child complaints are investigated by Compliance staff in the Early Intervention section. Decisions are issued within 60 calendar days of the receipt of the complaint, unless it is determined a longer period is necessary due to exceptional circumstances that exist with respect to a particular complaint, in which case an extension is made. If DESE, the SPOE or the provider is found out of compliance, DESE addresses in its decision how to remediate the noncompliance. If a written complaint is received that is also the subject of a due process hearing or contains multiple issues of which one or more are part of that hearing, the parts of the complaint being addressed in the due process hearing are set aside until the conclusion of the hearing. Missouri has a database to maintain data related to individual child complaints and track timelines for resolution of child complaints.

B. Due Process Hearing: Requests for a due process hearing must be made in writing to DESE, Office of Childhood. A Hearing Officer is assigned to conduct the hearing and issue a written decision within 30 days of the receipt of the request, unless the timelines have been extended by the parties.

If DESE or the parent disagrees with the Hearing Officer's final decision, either party has a right to appeal the decision to a State or Federal district court. The decision of the Hearing Officer is a final decision unless a party to the hearing appeals. Missouri has a database to maintain data related to due process requests and track timelines for due process hearing requests.

C. Mediation: Requests to settle disagreements through mediation may be made at any time, including prior to initiating a child complaint or due process hearing or after a child complaint or due process hearing has been requested. Both parties must agree to enter into mediation and agree on an impartial mediator selected from a list of qualified and trained mediators maintained by DESE. If mediation is successful, then a written agreement is developed and signed by the parent and a DESE representative. All discussions during mediations are confidential and may not be used in any subsequent due

process hearings or civil proceedings. Mediation must be completed within 30 days of the decision to mediate. Missouri has a database to maintain data related to mediation cases and track timelines for mediation requests.

Technical Assistance System:

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to early intervention service (EIS) programs.

System Point of Entry Contract

The State of Missouri contracts with a single System Point of Entry (SPOE) to operate the Part C program in each of the ten regions of the State. The current contract began on July 1, 2019 and runs on a five year cycle. Each agency awarded the contract employs certain staff, including a SPOE Director and a sufficient number of Service Coordinators and support staff to administer the program within the designated region.

On an annual basis, staff in the Early Intervention section review specific SPOE contract standards for child count, compliance, Early Intervention Teams, IFSP meeting activities, attendance at required meetings and a needs assessment plan. If a SPOE does not meet at least the minimum performance for each standard, liquidated damages are applied and a technical assistance plan is created to assist the SPOE with operations in the region.

The current SPOE contract contains requirements for working with families participating in Part C, including: (A) compliance standards; (B) transdisciplinary teams; and, (C) needs assessment.

A. Compliance Standards: Per contract requirements, each SPOE must comply with Federal and State regulations for implementing Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, and other laws or regulations related to the State's Part C program. Each SPOE Director is responsible for providing training and technical assistance to Service Coordinators, with help from the Senior Program Specialist. DESE conducts annual compliance monitoring to ensure SPOEs are implementing the regional program according to Federal and State regulations.

B. Transdisciplinary Teams: Per contract requirements, each SPOE implements Early Intervention Teams of providers to conduct evaluation and assessment activities and deliver early intervention services to families. Missouri's team model was established using best practices for serving children in natural environments according to nationally recognized recommended practices. Each SPOE Director is responsible for providing training and technical assistance to providers delivering services in the designated region, with help from the Senior Program Specialist.

C. Needs Assessment: Per contract requirements, each SPOE agency completes an annual needs assessment. The purpose of the needs assessment is to use data to identify the strengths and challenges in the regional system and identify areas that need training or technical assistance for Service Coordinators and providers in the region. The needs assessment may include observations of intake visits, IFSP meetings and provider practices in home visits. Each SPOE Director is responsible for using multiple data sources to inform any adjustments to the regional plan, with help from the Senior Program Specialist.

Statewide and Regional Technical Assistance

Staff in the Early Intervention section provide technical assistance in two ways: (A) statewide technical assistance; and, (B) regional technical assistance.

A. Statewide Technical Assistance: Staff provide guidance and instructions to SPOEs and providers on various topics related to Part C requirements, including: timely services; parental consent; the 45-day timeline; and transition from Part C to Part B. General Part C information is available statewide through the DESE website, including written documents such as a practice manual and recorded webinars. Quarterly, staff provide training for SPOE Directors and Service Coordinators to reiterate requirements and best practices in service delivery.

Additionally, information related to evidence-based practices in early intervention is provided to SPOEs and providers, including: natural environments; home visiting practices; child outcomes and effective transitions. Guidance documents on evidence-based practices are available on the DESE website. Senior Program Specialists provide training to SPOEs and providers to reinforce best practices for serving children with disabilities.

B. Regional Technical Assistance: In addition to statewide technical assistance, targeted technical assistance may be provided to a region based on a collection and review of different types of data in Missouri's Part C program. The need for regional technical assistance may be determined from a review of quantitative data (e.g., data posted monthly on the DESE website, canned reports available in the WebSPOE) or qualitative data (e.g., surveys of provider or Service Coordinator needs for additional information, training or meeting post-assessments, concerns about the quality of provider practices).

Targeted technical assistance is not intended to be a statewide activity, rather assistance to a specific region based on an identified need. However, if multiple regions are having the same issue, targeted technical assistance may become a statewide activity.

Through placing high emphasis on scheduled, statewide technical assistance, regular data reviews, targeted technical assistance and problem solving, staff in the Early Intervention section provide a comprehensive technical assistance system for Missouri's Part C program.

Professional Development System:

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers are effectively providing services that improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

Online Training Modules

The State has online training available to provide basic information about the Missouri Part C program. There are eight modules available to service providers that includes an orientation to the Part C program and addresses the process of assessment, identification of appropriate levels of service, family engagement, delivery of services in the natural environment, providing evidence-based practices and early childhood outcomes. The State is currently developing a ninth module to support the training of Early Intervention examiners on the use of the Developmental Assessment of Young Children as the State's uniform evaluation instrument to assist in eligibility determination.

Each module includes content, video, resources and an assessment to measure competency related to the topic addressed in the module. The modules

are provided at no-cost to the general public; however, individuals enrolling in the Missouri Part C program as an early intervention provider must successfully complete assessments. Individuals enrolling as an early intervention provider are required to complete the first module, as measured by a passing score of 80% on the assessment, prior to enrollment. Providers have six months from initial enrollment to complete the second, third and fourth modules. Modules five, six, seven and eight are optional for providers.

Individuals enrolling as Service Coordinators must complete the online training modules, as measured by a passing score of 80% on the assessment, prior to accepting a caseload.

The online training modules are reviewed and updated by staff in the Early Intervention section on an annual basis to ensure the content is consistent with all Federal and State regulations or State laws governing the Missouri Part C program.

Transdisciplinary Teams

Missouri began moving to a transdisciplinary team model in 2009 with full implementation in 2013. Missouri's current team model was established using the "Seven Key Principles: Looks Like/Doesn't Look Like," a document developed by the OSEP TA community of practice for Part C settings. This document outlines the key principles and concepts for delivering services in natural settings as well as examples illustrating what the practice should "look like."

With the implementation of the SSIP in indicator 11, the State has expanded on transdisciplinary teams to allow professional development (PD) time during EIT meetings. PD time allows for 15 to 45 minutes of paid time in EIT meetings to be used for activities that can improve child outcomes such as: practices related to child outcomes areas (e.g., social-emotional development, appropriate behaviors, typical development for infants and toddlers), knowledge of local resources available in the community, and information about child development or developmental milestones.

The topics to discuss during PD time are identified by each EIT and based on the unique needs of the providers on the team. Providers and Service Coordinators on each team may use checklists or tip sheets to use as visual aids. Teams are also allowed to have professionals outside the EIT attend as guest presenters to share information on topics that impact child outcomes (e.g., trauma, parent engagement).

With the new SPOE contract issued in 2019, all SPOEs were required to develop and implement EIT's with the necessary numbers and required disciplines as established in State guidance. SPOE Directors worked with existing EIT's, identified any necessary adjustments to the team structure and conducted evaluations of each teams functioning. Once adjustments were identified, SPOEs began implementing any necessary changes to EIT structure or number of EITs available in the region.

Broad Stakeholder Input:

The mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the State's targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 11, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).

The State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR), including targets, is developed and revised with review and input from DESE staff in Part B/619, State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) members and SPOE Directors. Staff in the Early Intervention section allocate time to discuss and review content and data in the SPP/APR at SICC and SPOE Director meetings throughout the fiscal year.

At the end of each calendar year, DESE sends a draft SPP/APR document to the SICC, which includes parents of children with disabilities, early intervention providers, State agency partners, and SPOE Directors for review prior to group discussion at meetings held each January.

These groups are asked to provide feedback to staff in the Early Intervention section in order for recommendations to be considered and incorporated into the final document submitted to the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs.

See the Soliciting Public Input section of the Introduction for additional Stakeholder engagement activities conducted for this submission.

Apply stakeholder input from introduction to all Part C results indicators (y/n)

YES

Number of Parent Members:

8

Parent Members Engagement:

Describe how the parent members of the Interagency Coordinating Council, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents were engaged in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

The State engaged the parent members of the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC), parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents via several virtual meetings. In December of 2021, the State facilitated three virtual focus groups for parents and other stakeholders during times that were convenient (lunch hour and evening) that provided information on targets, data, improvement strategies and evaluating progress and allowed for group discussion. Participants were also able to submit written comments in after the meetings.

The State also facilitated four virtual meetings with the SICC in March, September and November of 2021 and January of 2022 that included proposed targets, compliance and results data and improvement strategies. Public notice of those meetings is made at least two weeks in advance and the meetings are open to the general public.

Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:

Describe the activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.

The virtual focus groups for parents and other stakeholders were advertised using several different methods to encourage the participation from a diverse group of parents. Those methods included:

- email invitation sent to 313 parents representing both rural and urban regions of the State to ensure geographic diversity was considered. The parents selected had responded to the State's Part C family survey over the last three years and included their contact information to request to be included in future stakeholder activities.
- distribution in the Office of Childhood monthly newsletter, that goes out to nearly 11,000 early childhood stakeholders, in November and December of

2021. Currently there are 72 newsletter subscribers that identify themselves as parents for the purpose of receiving the newsletter. The newsletter is also distributed to Part C early intervention providers and to school district personnel across the state, including parent educators for young children birth to age three.

- included in the State's IDEA parent training center's monthly newsletter during November and December of 2021. This newsletter is distributed to approximately 8,800 contacts twice per month.
- sent directly to the ten SPOE agencies across the state to distribute to Service Coordinators, providers and families
- shared with parents and staff on the Missouri Head Start State Collaboration Office distribution lists
- shared with stakeholders on the MO Family to Family distribution lists

Additionally, meetings were held virtually during times that would be convenient for parents (e.g., lunch hour and evening) to encourage participation and promote access to those who would otherwise not be able to attend.

The State was intentional in the manner in which the proposed APR targets were presented to stakeholders, including parents, meaning the information was presented in a way that fostered meaningful engagement and equity in participation. The State utilized strategies such as clear, jargon free language, increased communication, open dialogue and providing actionable information that parents could use in support of their child or families experience with the Part C program.

The State is continually working on ways to integrate engagement of diverse groups of stakeholders, including parents, in Part C initiatives.

Soliciting Public Input:

The mechanisms and timelines for soliciting public input for setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.

Due to the ongoing impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, the mechanism the State used to solicit public input was virtual meetings with stakeholders. Those meetings included four SICC meetings throughout 2021 which are open to the public and notice given at a minimum of two weeks before the meeting. Additionally, virtual focus group meetings were held in December of 2021 with the target audience of parents, early intervention providers, members of the State's parent training center and other partners. Input on targets, data, improvement strategies and the State's progress was provided during the meetings via open discussion and written chat box comments. Additionally, all participants at each meeting were encouraged to send additional comments directly to the Part C Program Manager, if desired.

Making Results Available to the Public:

The mechanisms and timelines for making the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation available to the public.

The results of target setting, data analysis, development of improvement strategies and program evaluation were made available to the public via the January 2022 SICC meeting which is open to the public. Meeting handouts are made available in advance of the meeting and posted publicly on the DESE website.

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2019 performance of each EIS Program located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2019 APR, as required by 34 CFR §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its website, a complete copy of the State's SPP/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2019 APR in 2021, is available.

DESE reports annually to the public on the performance of the State and each SPOE compared to the targets established in the SPP/APR on indicators one through ten. The public report for each SPOE is compiled at the same time the SPP/APR is being prepared, and is posted within 120 days of the submission of the SPP/APR. Following clarification from OSEP, the public report for each SPOE, the Part C SPP/APR and other related documents are posted on the DESE website on the SPP/APR page at: <https://dese.mo.gov/special-education/state-performance-plan>. DESE also posts the State determination information on this page.

Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part C determination for both 2020 and 2021 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2021 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The State must report, with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2022, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

The State received a determination of needs assistance in 2020 and 2021 due to the State's Indicator 3: ECO data. All points lost were due to Missouri's lower than average, and decreasing, percentage of infants and toddlers who exit First Steps with age appropriate functioning/skills. Missouri's ECO data indicate that children are making progress while participating in Part C, but are not functioning within age expectations by the time they exit. As stated in previous submissions, the State believes the low trend in Summary Statement 2 data accurately reflects the State's eligibility criteria since Missouri has a half-age delay in development (i.e., narrow criteria) and does not serve infants and toddlers who are at risk of having substantial developmental delays. This is also supported by data showing that 75-80% of children who exit Part C at age three qualify for early childhood special education services under Part B. As long as the State's ECO data is compared to the data of other States that have a more broad eligibility criteria, Missouri will continue to lose points in the RDA matrix, which in turn impacts the State's determination.

Additionally, the State believes the decreasing trend in Summary Statement 2 data for Indicator 3 is a reflection of the data quality improvement activities conducted under Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP). In Phase I of the SSIP, the State determined the collection and determination of child outcome ratings were: (1) not consistent within or between regions in the State; (2) not frequent enough to accurately report progress; and (3) not meaningful to the family and other IFSP team members. These three issues were determined to be the root cause for data quality issues in Indicator 3. To address the root cause, the State initiated a pilot project that included new procedures for discussing, collecting and rating child outcomes. The pilot began in 2012-13 and the final regions of the state began implementing the new procedures in 2021. Over the years, as more regions implemented the new procedures, average ECO ratings decreased, again suggesting that the new procedures implemented as part of the SSIP are resulting in better data quality.

In addition to working with the last SPOE regions to scale up the ECO pilot, throughout 2021 State early intervention staff participated in a series of ECO data quality meetings facilitated by the Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy Center) and the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA). During the meetings, a review of the Part C ECO process, training materials, and forms were conducted. In an effort to better align Part C and Part B ECO processes and provide a consistent message, one minor change was made to the rating definition page that accompanies the decision tree. The State will continue to be a part of these meetings into 2022.

Intro - OSEP Response

The State's determinations for both 2020 and 2021 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to sections 616(e)(1) and 642 of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 303.704(a), OSEP's June 22, 2021 determination letter informed the State that it must report with its FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2022, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance. The State provided the required information.

The State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) submitted to the Secretary its annual report that is required under IDEA section 641(e)(1)(D) and 34 C.F.R. § 303.604(c). The SICC noted it has elected to support the State lead agency's submission of its SPP/APR as its annual report in lieu of submitting a separate report. OSEP accepts the SICC form, which will not be posted publicly with the State's SPP/APR documents.

Intro - Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part C determination for both 2021 and 2022 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2022 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The State must report, with its FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2023, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

Indicator 1: Timely Provision of Services

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Compliance indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with Individual Family Service Plans (IFSPs) who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Include the State's criteria for "timely" receipt of early intervention services (i.e., the time period from parent consent to when IFSP services are actually initiated).

Measurement

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

Account for untimely receipt of services, including the reasons for delays.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select early intervention service (EIS) programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. States report in both the numerator and denominator under Indicator 1 on the number of children for whom the State ensured the timely initiation of new services identified on the IFSP. Include the timely initiation of new early intervention services from both initial IFSPs and subsequent IFSPs. Provide actual numbers used in the calculation.

The State's timeliness measure for this indicator must be either: (1) a time period that runs from when the parent consents to IFSP services; or (2) the IFSP initiation date (established by the IFSP Team, including the parent).

States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in the Office of Special Education Programs' (OSEP's) response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

1 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	69.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	97.58%	96.04%	97.30%	96.40%	96.00%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
119	139	96.00%	100%	97.84%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

This number will be added to the "Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive their early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner" field above to calculate the numerator for this indicator.

17

Provide reasons for delay, if applicable.

The delays reported are due to two of the ten SPOE regions having unacceptable reasons for the delay. One SPOE region had two unacceptable reasons for delay and one SPOE region had one unacceptable reason for the delay. All of the reasons for delay were due to provider delays, such as provider scheduling conflicts and provider availability issues. The provider types involved were occupational therapy, special instruction and speech/language pathology. Due to this, the State sees no pattern in the practices of a particular SPOE region or provider type.

Include your State's criteria for "timely" receipt of early intervention services (i.e., the time period from parent consent to when IFSP services are actually initiated).

In Missouri, services for infants and toddlers with IFSPs must begin within 30 days of parental consent to be considered timely. Timely services are determined by comparing the date of parental consent for the service to the first date the service was provided.

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State monitoring

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

All ten SPOE's are monitored each year, as described in the General Supervision System section in the Introduction.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Missouri Part C found the pandemic had no impact on the State's ability to collect and report data.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
6	6	0	0

FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

To verify correction of noncompliance, State staff requested and reviewed at least five updated files for each finding of noncompliance. The State was able to verify each System Point of Entry (SPOE) with identified noncompliance was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected.

The State reviewed updated documentation for each individual case of noncompliance and confirmed the SPOE initiated services, although late, for any child whose services were not initiated in a timely manner, unless the child was no longer within the jurisdiction of the SPOE.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

For all findings issued, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, both prongs of correction must be verified by Compliance staff in order to declare the SPOE 100% in compliance on the indicator: (1) at the child level, documentation that indicates the individual noncompliance has been corrected, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the SPOE; and, (2) at the SPOE level, documentation from five new files, completed after the SPOE's corrective action plan was implemented, that indicates the SPOE is correctly implementing the requirement. All noncompliance, both at the individual child level and at the SPOE level, must be corrected as soon as possible, but no later than 12 months from the date the SPOE agency is notified of noncompliance.

Timely correction of noncompliance is ensured through the use of the web-based monitoring system, Improvement Monitoring Accountability and Compliance System (IMACS) and frequent contact with the SPOEs by Senior Program Specialist and other State staff. SPOEs are informed about the consequences for failure to correct noncompliance within 12 months. As outlined in the SPOE contractual requirements, any SPOE agency not willing or able to correct noncompliance within 12 months of receiving notification (timely correction) is subject to liquidated damages.

1 - OSEP Response**1 - Required Actions**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings data collection in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State's 618 data reported in Table 2. If not, explain.

2 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	96.90%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target>=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	97.00%	97.00%
Data	99.46%	99.41%	99.39%	99.46%	99.69%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%	97.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR), including targets, is developed and revised with review and input from DESE staff in Part B/619, State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) members and SPOE Directors. Staff in the Early Intervention section allocate time to discuss and review content and data in the SPP/APR at SICC and SPOE Director meetings throughout the fiscal year.

At the end of each calendar year, DESE sends a draft SPP/APR document to the SICC, which includes parents of children with disabilities, early intervention providers, State agency partners, and SPOE Directors for review prior to group discussion at meetings held each January.

These groups are asked to provide feedback to staff in the Early Intervention section in order for recommendations to be considered and incorporated into the final document submitted to the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs.

See the Soliciting Public Input section of the Introduction for additional Stakeholder engagement activities conducted for this submission.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings Survey; Section A: Child Count and Settings by Age	07/08/2021	Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	6,773
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings Survey; Section A: Child Count and Settings by Age	07/08/2021	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	6,792

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	Total number of Infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
6,773	6,792	99.69%	97.00%	99.72%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

Missouri Part C found the pandemic had no impact on the State's ability to collect and report data.

2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

2 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

2 - Required Actions

Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Data Source

State selected data source.

Measurement

Outcomes:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning = [(# of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

Summary Statement 1: Of those infants and toddlers who entered early intervention below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 1:

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in category (d)) divided by (# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (a) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (b) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

Summary Statement 2: The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

Measurement for Summary Statement 2:

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (e)) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of infants and toddlers with IFSPs is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement, include in the numerator and denominator only infants and toddlers with IFSPs who received early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.

Report: (1) the number of infants and toddlers who exited the Part C program during the reporting period, as reported in the State's Part C exiting data under Section 618 of the IDEA; and (2) the number of those infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements.

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers." If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Process (COS), then the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

If the State's Part C eligibility criteria include infants and toddlers who are at risk of having substantial developmental delays (or "at-risk infants and toddlers") under IDEA section 632(5)(B)(i), the State must report data in two ways. First, it must report on all eligible children but exclude its at-risk infants and toddlers (i.e., include just those infants and toddlers experiencing developmental delay (or "developmentally delayed children") or having a diagnosed physical or mental condition that has a high probability of resulting in developmental delay (or "children with diagnosed conditions")). Second, the State must separately report outcome data on either: (1) just its at-risk infants and toddlers; or (2) aggregated performance data on all of the infants and toddlers it serves under Part C (including developmentally delayed children, children with diagnosed conditions, and at-risk infants and toddlers).

3 - Indicator Data

Does your State's Part C eligibility criteria include infants and toddlers who are at risk of having substantial developmental delays (or "at-risk infants and toddlers") under IDEA section 632(5)(B)(i)? (yes/no)

NO

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR), including targets, is developed and revised with review and input from DESE staff in Part B/619, State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) members and SPOE Directors. Staff in the Early Intervention section allocate time to discuss and review content and data in the SPP/APR at SICC and SPOE Director meetings throughout the fiscal year.

At the end of each calendar year, DESE sends a draft SPP/APR document to the SICC, which includes parents of children with disabilities, early intervention providers, State agency partners, and SPOE Directors for review prior to group discussion at meetings held each January.

These groups are asked to provide feedback to staff in the Early Intervention section in order for recommendations to be considered and incorporated into the final document submitted to the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs.

See the Soliciting Public Input section of the Introduction for additional Stakeholder engagement activities conducted for this submission.

Historical Data

Outcome	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A1	2009	Target>=	69.20%	69.20%	69.20%	69.20%	69.20%
A1	69.10%	Data	87.22%	88.36%	90.28%	90.42%	90.82%
A2	2020	Target>=	20.00%	20.00%	20.00%	47.50%	47.50%
A2	10.51%	Data	25.97%	22.57%	21.26%	18.27%	13.60%
B1	2009	Target>=	70.40%	70.40%	70.40%	70.40%	70.40%
B1	70.30%	Data	88.63%	90.03%	91.53%	91.50%	90.86%
B2	2020	Target>=	20.00%	20.00%	20.00%	45.60%	45.60%
B2	8.17%	Data	19.18%	17.04%	16.37%	13.89%	11.22%
C1	2009	Target>=	73.10%	73.10%	73.10%	73.10%	73.10%
C1	73.00%	Data	88.73%	90.09%	91.17%	91.21%	91.50%
C2	2020	Target>=	15.00%	15.00%	15.00%	36.20%	36.20%
C2	9.27%	Data	26.26%	22.66%	20.20%	17.21%	12.33%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A1>=	88.00%	88.00%	89.00%	89.00%	90.00%	90.00%
Target A2>=	7.00%	7.00%	8.00%	8.00%	9.00%	10.52%
Target B1>=	88.00%	88.00%	89.00%	89.00%	90.00%	90.00%
Target B2>=	7.00%	7.00%	8.00%	8.00%	9.00%	9.00%
Target C1>=	88.00%	88.00%	89.00%	89.00%	90.00%	90.00%
Target C2>=	7.00%	7.00%	8.00%	8.00%	9.00%	9.28%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed

4,101

Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	63	1.54%

Outcome A Progress Category	Number of children	Percentage of Total
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	272	6.63%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	3,335	81.32%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	348	8.49%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	83	2.02%

Outcome A	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	3,683	4,018	90.82%	88.00%	91.66%	Met target	No Slippage
A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	431	4,101	13.60%	7.00%	10.51%	N/A	N/A

Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)

Outcome B Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	105	2.56%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	232	5.66%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	3,429	83.61%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	306	7.46%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	29	0.71%

Outcome B	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	3,735	4,072	90.86%	88.00%	91.72%	Met target	No Slippage
B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	335	4,101	11.22%	7.00%	8.17%	N/A	N/A

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	87	2.12%

Outcome C Progress Category	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	245	5.97%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	3,389	82.64%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	349	8.51%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	31	0.76%

Outcome C	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	3,738	4,070	91.50%	88.00%	91.84%	Met target	No Slippage
C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	380	4,101	12.33%	7.00%	9.27%	N/A	N/A

The number of infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.

Question	Number
The number of infants and toddlers who exited the Part C program during the reporting period, as reported in the State's Part C exiting 618 data	5,337
The number of those infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.	830

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COS) process? (yes/no)

NO

Provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers."

Based on the ratings determined at entry and exit, "comparable to same-aged peers" is defined as a rating of "5" on a scale of 1-5, meaning "completely (all of the time/typical)" in response to the question "To what extent does this child show age-appropriate functioning, across a variety of settings and situations?" A rating of "5" roughly translates to a 0-10% delay.

List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

Instruments for Collecting Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO)

Missouri has not identified a specific assessment instrument(s) for collecting ECO data. Instead, the State follows the Division for Early Childhood's (DEC) recommendation that "children with special needs be assessed with a variety of measures that are reflective of the context of the child's daily life and can provide a valid picture of his or her needs; including authentic measures that allow a child to demonstrate a behavior or skill in multiple settings and across time." The provider delivering services to the child decides the methodology to assess the child's skills and behaviors, including both formal assessment tools and/or informal assessment activities. Depending on the provider discipline, the type of formal assessment instruments vary (e.g., DAYC second edition, HELP, BDI-3).

Procedures for Reporting Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO)

Each eligible child entering the Part C program must have an ECO rating if the child has the potential of being in the program at least six months. The child's provider, in collaboration with the child's Service Coordinator, must use three sources of information in order to collect ECO data. The three sources of information are parent input, professional observation and assessment results.

- Parent input may include parent observations, information from an interview with the parent or other form of parent report.
- Provider observation may include notes from a testing session, structured observations in a daily routine or other observation activity.
- Assessment results may include informal or formal measures of assessing the child's abilities as determined by the IFSP team.

These sources are used in the discussion about the child's progress and current skills as well as to answer questions from the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Decision Tree and Missouri Definition of Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Ratings document to determine a rating for each outcome

area.

After a discussion about the child's progress and current skills, the IFSP team uses questions from the ECO Decision Tree and Missouri Definition of ECO Ratings document to determine a rating for each outcome area.

A rating between 1-5 is determined for each of the three outcome indicators with 1 meaning "Not Yet" and 5 meaning "Completely." Entry and exit data are collected as part of the first and last IFSP meeting with the family. Regardless of the pilot status, all Part C entry and exit data are entered into the electronic child record system, WebSPOE. The outcome status for each child is determined by comparing the entry and exit ratings. SPOE staff monitor ECO data on a monthly basis to determine training or technical assistance needs and the State analyzes the outcome data at the end of each fiscal year.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

The State is proposing to reset the baseline for each of the Indicator 3 summary statement 2 categories to FFY 2020. Summary statement 2 is the percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

Since 2009, the original baseline year, Missouri has had slippage in summary statement 2 data. Although, results indicate children make progress while participating in Missouri Part C but are not functioning at age expectation by the time they exit. The State lowered the targets in 2013 for each summary statement 2 area to reflect the consistently decreasing data. Also in 2013, the State implemented a new pilot project that aimed to collect more accurate, consistent, and meaningful ECO ratings which launched the State's SSIP project when Indicator 11 was added to the APR.

It is important to the State and to our local programs that targets be attainable. Original targets were set based on data from a small pilot that used parent report as the primary data collection source and focused on the child's progress, not comparison to same aged peers, which is the data that summary statement 2 collects. The current data trends should be used to establish targets that reflect the State's eligibility criteria since Missouri has a half-age delay in development (i.e., narrow criteria) and does not serve infants and toddlers who are at risk of having substantial developmental delays.

Since the State's methodology for collecting ECO data has changed since the original baseline was created and the consistent slippage of summary statement 2 data indicating original baseline was too high, the State is proposing to reset the baseline for each summary statement 2 to the FFY 2020 data reported in this APR. The SICC and other stakeholders supported the State's proposed resetting of baseline for all summary statement 2's.

Although the State's methodology for collecting ECO changed, the State did not propose to reset the baseline for summary statement 1's (A1, B1 and C1) as historical data trends indicate consistent data with demonstrated progress over time since the original baseline set in 2009. The data are also representative of those children who entered the program below age expectations, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program, thus the State determined a change in the existing baseline for A1, B1 and C1 was not warranted. The SICC and other stakeholders supported the State's proposal to maintain these baselines.

Overall, summary statement 1 data have shown to be valid, reliable and consistent over time. However, data for summary statement 2 do not show the same trends; therefore, the State is taking a different approach with the strategies to improve data quality.

Additionally, Missouri Part C found the pandemic had no impact on the State's ability to collect and report data.

3 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

3 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

OSEP notes the State has provided baselines using data from FFY 2009 for A1, B1, and C1, and using data from FFY 2020 for A2, B2, and C2. However, OSEP would expect that all summary statements would use a consistent baseline year.

3 - Required Actions

The State has provided baselines using data from FFY 2009 for A1, B1, and C1, and using data from FFY 2020 for A2, B2, and C2. The State must revise baselines to use data from the same year across summary statements in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, and with stakeholder input, revise any targets as appropriate to ensure the FFY 2025 targets reflect improvement over baseline.

Indicator 4: Family Involvement

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Results indicator: Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:

- A. Know their rights;
- B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and
- C. Help their children develop and learn.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Data Source

State selected data source. State must describe the data source in the SPP/APR.

Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling of families participating in Part C is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See [General Instructions](#) page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of families to whom the surveys were distributed and the number of respondent families participating in Part C. The survey response rate is auto calculated using the submitted data.

States will be required to compare the current year's response rate to the previous year(s) response rate(s), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of families that received Part C services.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the infants or toddlers for whom families responded are representative of the demographics of infants and toddlers receiving services in the Part C program. States should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, age of infant or toddler, and geographic location in the State.

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group)

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the infants or toddlers for whom families responded are not representative of the demographics of infants and toddlers receiving services in the Part C program, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to families (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person), if a survey was used, and how responses were collected.

Beginning with the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2024, when reporting the extent to which the demographics of the infants or toddlers for whom families responded are representative of the demographics of infants and toddlers enrolled in the Part C program, States must include race and ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State's analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: socioeconomic status, parents or guardians whose primary language is other than English and who have limited English proficiency, maternal education, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

4 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Measure	Baseline	FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
A	2006	Target>=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%
A	92.30 %	Data	98.67%	98.53%	99.30%	99.05%	98.92%
B	2006	Target>=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	95.70%	95.70%
B	95.60 %	Data	97.22%	96.80%	98.60%	97.03%	97.47%
C	2006	Target>=	95.00%	95.00%	95.00%	96.40%	96.40%

C	96.30 %	Data	97.33%	97.60%	98.83%	98.34%	97.23%
---	---------	------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target A>=	95.70%	95.70%	96.70%	96.70%	97.70%	97.70%
Target B>=	95.70%	95.70%	96.70%	96.70%	97.70%	97.70%
Target C>=	96.40%	96.40%	97.40%	97.40%	98.00%	98.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR), including targets, is developed and revised with review and input from DESE staff in Part B/619, State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) members and SPOE Directors. Staff in the Early Intervention section allocate time to discuss and review content and data in the SPP/APR at SICC and SPOE Director meetings throughout the fiscal year.

At the end of each calendar year, DESE sends a draft SPP/APR document to the SICC, which includes parents of children with disabilities, early intervention providers, State agency partners, and SPOE Directors for review prior to group discussion at meetings held each January.

These groups are asked to provide feedback to staff in the Early Intervention section in order for recommendations to be considered and incorporated into the final document submitted to the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs.

See the Soliciting Public Input section of the Introduction for additional Stakeholder engagement activities conducted for this submission.

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

The number of families to whom surveys were distributed	4,881
Number of respondent families participating in Part C	912
Survey Response Rate	18.68%
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	894
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	903
B1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	869
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	893
C1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	893
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	904

Measure	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights (A1 divided by A2)	98.92%	95.70%	99.00%	Met target	No Slippage
B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs (B1 divided by B2)	97.47%	95.70%	97.31%	Met target	No Slippage
C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn (C1 divided by C2)	97.23%	96.40%	98.78%	Met target	No Slippage

Sampling Question	Yes / No
Was sampling used?	NO

Question	Yes / No
Was a collection tool used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised collection tool?	NO
The demographics of the infants or toddlers for whom families responded are representative of the demographics of infants and toddlers enrolled in the Part C program.	NO

If not, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.

To increase the representativeness of Black families responding to the family survey, the State will increase outreach to places and services in communities with predominantly Black populations. The State will use census data to identify regions with predominantly Black population and support regional staff with outreach activities in an effort to increase the response rate from Black parents.

Survey Response Rate

FFY	2019	2020
Survey Response Rate	18.84%	18.68%

Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

In the SPOE contracts released in 2019 for regional service coordination services, the State included an incentive in the contract that each contractor shall increase the percentage of families who respond to the State agency annual survey for each region by 2% over the prior year's response rate. If the contractor meets the minimum performance standards for each region the State agency shall pay an incentive to the contractor during the contract period that the standard was met. Additionally, regional and State representativeness data, which included race and ethnicity, from those parents that responded to the survey was reviewed with SPOE Directors and State staff in November of 2021. Regional staff representing urban and rural areas of the State were given the opportunity to brainstorm and share ideas, success, and challenges with increasing regional response rates.

Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of families that received Part C services.

To promote response from a broad section of families, in 2020-21, paper surveys, with self-addressed stamped envelopes, were sent to families with children in the program for at least six months. Families were given the option to submit responses online instead of mailing back the paper survey. A quick response (QR) code is included with the paper survey for the convenience of parents who prefer electronic means. If a family had more than one child in the Part C program, the family received more than one survey.

Additionally, the State gives approximately one month for families to return survey responses. The distribution of the survey is advertised via the State's parent training and information center's monthly newsletter, mailings sent to parents via the CFO, and directly to parents from the Service Coordinators and early intervention providers. Response rates across regions indicated a high rate of agreement of survey items across all respondents. This indicates there is no nonresponse bias.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the infants or toddlers for whom families responded are representative of the demographics of infants and toddlers enrolled in the Part C program. States should consider categories such as race/ethnicity, age of infant or toddler, and geographic location in the State.

The State analyzed three demographic items from 2020-21 survey responses: the region in which the child resides, the child's age and race/ethnicity of survey respondents. The response rate for each region was within +/-2.5% of the percent of children served in that region with response rates by region ranging from 14.4% to 21.3%. In reviewing age of child, the average age of children of respondents was 25.9 months and the average age of all children with IFSPs was 23.1 months, indicating representativeness by age and location.

Race/ethnicity was added to the parent survey in 2020-21. Data analysis indicates under-representation of Black parents (16.9% of child count and 6.8% of survey responses) although an over-representation of multi-racial parents (5.9% of child count and 9.5% of survey responses) could offset the discrepancy if the race/ethnicity indicated on the survey was different than the child's race/ethnicity in the Part C data system. White parents made up 80.6% of survey responses compared to 75.2% of the child count.

In summary, regional and age data show representativeness in the survey responses, however, differences seen in the Black and White populations, even after adjusting by the multi-racial population, suggest that Black parent responses are under-represented in the data by 6-10%.

Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy, age of the infant or toddler, and geographic location in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

The metric used to determine representativeness is +/- 6% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

Missouri Part C found the pandemic had no impact on the State's ability to collect and report data.

4 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

4 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

4 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must report whether its FFY 2021 response data are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program , and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the families responding are representative of the population.

Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings data collection in the *EDFacts* Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)) and Census (for the denominator).

Measurement

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 1)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations. The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State's reported 618 data reported in Table 1. If not, explain why.

5 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	0.71%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	0.80%	0.80%	0.80%	0.80%	0.80%
Data	1.26%	1.33%	1.33%	1.35%	1.38%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR), including targets, is developed and revised with review and input from DESE staff in Part B/619, State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) members and SPOE Directors. Staff in the Early Intervention section allocate time to discuss and review content and data in the SPP/APR at SICC and SPOE Director meetings throughout the fiscal year.

At the end of each calendar year, DESE sends a draft SPP/APR document to the SICC, which includes parents of children with disabilities, early intervention providers, State agency partners, and SPOE Directors for review prior to group discussion at meetings held each January.

These groups are asked to provide feedback to staff in the Early Intervention section in order for recommendations to be considered and incorporated into the final document submitted to the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs.

See the Soliciting Public Input section of the Introduction for additional Stakeholder engagement activities conducted for this submission.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings Survey; Section A: Child Count and Settings by Age	07/08/2021	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	906
Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin: April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2020	07/08/2021	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	71,649

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
906	71,649	1.38%	1.00%	1.26%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Missouri Part C found the pandemic had no impact on the State's ability to collect and report data.

5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

5 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

5 - Required Actions

Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Results indicator: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Data Source

Data collected under IDEA section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings data collection in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)) and Census (for the denominator).

Measurement

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 3)] times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations . The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State's reported 618 data reported in Table 1. If not, explain why.

6 - Indicator Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	1.48%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target >=	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%	2.00%
Data	2.64%	2.87%	2.95%	3.16%	3.29%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target >=	2.50%	2.50%	2.50%	2.50%	2.50%	2.50%

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR), including targets, is developed and revised with review and input from DESE staff in Part B/619, State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) members and SPOE Directors. Staff in the Early Intervention section allocate time to discuss and review content and data in the SPP/APR at SICC and SPOE Director meetings throughout the fiscal year.

At the end of each calendar year, DESE sends a draft SPP/APR document to the SICC, which includes parents of children with disabilities, early intervention providers, State agency partners, and SPOE Directors for review prior to group discussion at meetings held each January.

These groups are asked to provide feedback to staff in the Early Intervention section in order for recommendations to be considered and incorporated into the final document submitted to the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs.

See the Soliciting Public Input section of the Introduction for additional Stakeholder engagement activities conducted for this submission.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings Survey; Section A: Child Count and Settings by Age	07/08/2021	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	6,792
Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin: April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2020	07/08/2021	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	217,943

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
6,792	217,943	3.29%	2.50%	3.12%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

Missouri Part C found the pandemic had no impact on the State's ability to collect and report data.

6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

6 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

6 - Required Actions

Indicator 7: 45-Day Timeline

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system and must address the timeline from point of referral to initial IFSP meeting based on actual, not an average, number of days.

Measurement

Percent = [(# of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline) divided by the (# of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted)] times 100.

Account for untimely evaluations, assessments, and initial IFSP meetings, including the reasons for delays.

Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide actual numbers used in the calculation.

States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

7 - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	90.90%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.21%	98.21%	98.28%	100.00%	100.00%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline	Number of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
71	80	100.00%	100%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

This number will be added to the "Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline" field above to calculate the numerator for this indicator.

Provide reasons for delay, if applicable.

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State monitoring

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

All ten SPOEs are monitored each year, as described in the General Supervision System section in the Introduction.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

Missouri Part C found the pandemic had no impact on the State's ability to collect and report data.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

7 - OSEP Response

7 - Required Actions

Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the State educational agency (SEA) and the local educational agency (LEA) where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

A. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday)}}{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)}} \right] \times 100$.

B. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services)}}{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)}} \right] \times 100$.

C. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B)}}{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)}} \right] \times 100$.

Account for untimely transition planning under 8A, 8B, and 8C, including the reasons for delays.

Instructions

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Indicators 8A and 8C: If data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. If data are from State monitoring, also describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Indicators 8A and 8C: States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Indicator 8B: Under 34 CFR §303.401(e), the State may adopt a written policy that requires the lead agency to provide notice to the parent of an eligible child with an IFSP of the impending notification to the SEA and LEA under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §303.209(b)(1) and (2) and permits the parent within a specified time period to "opt-out" of the referral. Under the State's opt-out policy, the State is not required to include in the calculation under 8B (in either the numerator or denominator) the number of children for whom the parents have opted out. However, the State must include in the discussion of data, the number of parents who opted out. In addition, any written opt-out policy must be on file with the Department of Education as part of the State's Part C application under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §§303.209(b) and 303.401(d).

Indicator 8C: The measurement is intended to capture those children for whom a transition conference must be held within the required timeline and, as such, only children between 2 years 3 months and age 3 should be included in the denominator.

Indicator 8C: Do not include in the calculation, but provide a separate number for those toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference.

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

8A - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	60.10%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Data	100.00%	92.59%	93.75%	90.00%	90.00%
------	---------	--------	--------	--------	--------

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Data include only those toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday. (yes/no)

YES

Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
87	92	90.00%	100%	95.65%	Did not meet target	No Slippage

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

This number will be added to the "Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services" field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.

1

Provide reasons for delay, if applicable.

The State did not meet the target of 100% compliance but there was no slippage from the previous year. Four of the ten SPOE regions had noncompliance with this indicator. The delays reported are due to four of the ten SPOE regions each having one unacceptable reason for the delay. The reasons for delay included the parent not being present for the transition plan IFSP meeting and Service Coordinators not appropriately documenting the required transition steps and services in the IFSP. In most cases, the required transition steps and services were conducted; however, they were not documented in the IFSP.

Due to the complexity of the transition requirements, the State provides ongoing training and technical assistance to all SPOEs on the topic of transition from Part C in addition to ensuring all noncompliance is corrected in a timely manner consistent with OSEP memo 09-02.

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State monitoring

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

All ten SPOEs are monitored each year, as described in the General Supervision System section in the Introduction.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Missouri Part C found the pandemic had no impact on the State's ability to collect and report data.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
9	9	0	0

FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

To verify correction of noncompliance, State staff requested and reviewed at least five updated files for each finding of noncompliance. The State was able to verify each System Point of Entry (SPOE) with identified noncompliance was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected.

The State reviewed updated documentation for each individual case of noncompliance and confirmed the SPOE developed a transition plan with steps and services, although late, for any child whose transition plan was delayed, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the SPOE.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

8A - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

For all findings issued, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, both prongs of correction must be verified by Compliance staff in order to declare the SPOE 100% in compliance on the indicator: (1) at the child level, documentation that indicates the individual noncompliance has been corrected, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the SPOE; and, (2) at the SPOE level, documentation from five new files, completed after the SPOE's corrective action plan was implemented, that indicates the SPOE is correctly implementing the requirement. All noncompliance, both at the individual child level and at the SPOE level, must be corrected as soon as possible, but no later than 12 months from the date the SPOE agency is notified of noncompliance.

Timely correction of noncompliance is ensured through the use of the web-based monitoring system, Improvement Monitoring Accountability and Compliance System (IMACS) and frequent contact with the SPOEs by Senior Program Specialist and other State staff. SPOEs are informed about the consequences for failure to correct noncompliance within 12 months. As outlined in the SPOE contractual requirements, any SPOE agency not willing or able to correct noncompliance within 12 months of receiving notification (timely correction) is subject to liquidated damages.

8A - OSEP Response

8A - Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the State educational agency (SEA) and the local educational agency (LEA) where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

A. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday)}}{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)}} \right] \times 100$.

B. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services)}}{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)}} \right] \times 100$.

C. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B)}}{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)}} \right] \times 100$.

Account for untimely transition planning under 8A, 8B, and 8C, including the reasons for delays.

Instructions

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Indicators 8A and 8C: If data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. If data are from State monitoring, also describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Indicators 8A and 8C: States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Indicator 8B: Under 34 CFR §303.401(e), the State may adopt a written policy that requires the lead agency to provide notice to the parent of an eligible child with an IFSP of the impending notification to the SEA and LEA under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §303.209(b)(1) and (2) and permits the parent within a specified time period to "opt-out" of the referral. Under the State's opt-out policy, the State is not required to include in the calculation under 8B (in either the numerator or denominator) the number of children for whom the parents have opted out. However, the State must include in the discussion of data, the number of parents who opted out. In addition, any written opt-out policy must be on file with the Department of Education as part of the State's Part C application under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §§303.209(b) and 303.401(d).

Indicator 8C: The measurement is intended to capture those children for whom a transition conference must be held within the required timeline and, as such, only children between 2 years 3 months and age 3 should be included in the denominator.

Indicator 8C: Do not include in the calculation, but provide a separate number for those toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference.

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

8B - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	64.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Data	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	98.53%	98.88%
------	---------	---------	---------	--------	--------

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA

YES

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
90	92	98.88%	100%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Number of parents who opted out

This number will be subtracted from the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the denominator for this indicator.

2

Provide reasons for delay, if applicable.

Describe the method used to collect these data.

All ten SPOEs are monitored each year, as described in the General Supervision System section in the Introduction.

Do you have a written opt-out policy? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, is the policy on file with the Department? (yes/no)

YES

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State monitoring

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

All ten SPOEs are monitored each year, as described in the General Supervision System section in the Introduction.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

Missouri Part C found the pandemic had no impact on the State's ability to collect and report data.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
1	1	0	0

FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*.

To verify correction of noncompliance, State staff requested and reviewed at least five updated files for each finding of noncompliance. The State was able to verify each System Point of Entry (SPOE) with identified noncompliance was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected.

The State reviewed updated documentation for each individual case of noncompliance and confirmed the SPOE sent notification to the SEA and LEA, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the SPOE.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

8B - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

For all findings issued, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, both prongs of correction must be verified by Compliance staff in order to declare the SPOE 100% in compliance on the indicator: (1) at the child level, documentation that indicates the individual noncompliance has been corrected, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the SPOE; and, (2) at the SPOE level, documentation from five new files, completed after the SPOE's corrective action plan was implemented, that indicates the SPOE is correctly implementing the requirement. All noncompliance, both at the individual child level and at the SPOE level, must be corrected as soon as possible, but no later than 12 months from the date the SPOE agency is notified of noncompliance.

Timely correction of noncompliance is ensured through the use of the web-based monitoring system, Improvement Monitoring Accountability and Compliance System (IMACS) and frequent contact with the SPOEs by Senior Program Specialist and other State staff. SPOEs are informed about the consequences for failure to correct noncompliance within 12 months. As outlined in the SPOE contractual requirements, any SPOE agency not willing or able to correct noncompliance within 12 months of receiving notification (timely correction) is subject to liquidated damages.

8B - OSEP Response

8B - Required Actions

Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the State educational agency (SEA) and the local educational agency (LEA) where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

Measurement

A. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday)}}{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)}} \right] \times 100$.

B. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services)}}{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)}} \right] \times 100$.

C. Percent = $\left[\frac{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B)}}{\text{(\# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)}} \right] \times 100$.

Account for untimely transition planning under 8A, 8B, and 8C, including the reasons for delays.

Instructions

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Indicators 8A and 8C: If data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. If data are from State monitoring, also describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Indicators 8A and 8C: States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Indicator 8B: Under 34 CFR §303.401(e), the State may adopt a written policy that requires the lead agency to provide notice to the parent of an eligible child with an IFSP of the impending notification to the SEA and LEA under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §303.209(b)(1) and (2) and permits the parent within a specified time period to "opt-out" of the referral. Under the State's opt-out policy, the State is not required to include in the calculation under 8B (in either the numerator or denominator) the number of children for whom the parents have opted out. However, the State must include in the discussion of data, the number of parents who opted out. In addition, any written opt-out policy must be on file with the Department of Education as part of the State's Part C application under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §§303.209(b) and 303.401(d).

Indicator 8C: The measurement is intended to capture those children for whom a transition conference must be held within the required timeline and, as such, only children between 2 years 3 months and age 3 should be included in the denominator.

Indicator 8C: Do not include in the calculation, but provide a separate number for those toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference.

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2019), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

8C - Indicator Data

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	57.00%

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Data	100.00%	98.75%	98.75%	100.00%	96.63%
------	---------	--------	--------	---------	--------

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Data reflect only those toddlers for whom the Lead Agency has conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services. (yes/no)

YES

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
87	92	96.63%	100%	100.00%	Met target	No Slippage

Number of toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference

This number will be subtracted from the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the denominator for this indicator.

2

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

This number will be added to the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.

3

Provide reasons for delay, if applicable.

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State monitoring

Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

All ten SPOEs are monitored each year, as described in the General Supervision System section in the Introduction

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

Missouri Part C found the pandemic had no impact on the State's ability to collect and report data.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2019

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
3	3	0	0

FFY 2019 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the *regulatory requirements*.

To verify correction of noncompliance, State staff requested and reviewed at least five updated files for each finding of noncompliance. The State was able to verify each System Point of Entry (SPOE) with identified noncompliance was correctly implementing the regulatory requirements.

Describe how the State verified that each *individual case* of noncompliance was corrected.

The State reviewed updated documentation for each individual case of noncompliance and confirmed the SPOE conducted the transition conference with the approval of the family, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the SPOE.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2019

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2019 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

8C - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2019, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2019 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019, although its FFY 2019 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2019.

Response to actions required in FFY 2019 SPP/APR

For all findings issued, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, both prongs of correction must be verified by Compliance staff in order to declare the SPOE 100% in compliance on the indicator: (1) at the child level, documentation that indicates the individual noncompliance has been corrected, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the SPOE; and, (2) at the SPOE level, documentation from five new files, completed after the SPOE's corrective action plan was implemented, that indicates the SPOE is correctly implementing the requirement. All noncompliance, both at the individual child level and at the SPOE level, must be corrected as soon as possible, but no later than 12 months from the date the SPOE agency is notified of noncompliance.

Timely correction of noncompliance is ensured through the use of the web-based monitoring system, Improvement Monitoring Accountability and Compliance System (IMACS) and frequent contact with the SPOEs by Senior Program Specialist and other State staff. SPOEs are informed about the consequences for failure to correct noncompliance within 12 months. As outlined in the SPOE contractual requirements, any SPOE agency not willing or able to correct noncompliance within 12 months of receiving notification (timely correction) is subject to liquidated damages.

8C - OSEP Response

8C - Required Actions

Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures under section 615 of the IDEA are adopted). (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

This indicator is not applicable to a State that has adopted Part C due process procedures under section 639 of the IDEA.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, the State must develop baseline and targets and report them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's 618 data, explain.

States are not required to report data at the EIS program level.

9 - Indicator Data

Not Applicable

Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.

YES

Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.

This indicator is not applicable because Missouri Part C did not adopt Part B due process procedures.

9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

9 - OSEP Response

OSEP notes that this indicator is not applicable.

9 - Required Actions

Indicator 10: Mediation

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

Measurement

Percent = $[(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) \text{ divided by } 2.1] \text{ times } 100$.

Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of mediations reaches 10 or greater, the State must develop baseline and targets and report them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

The consensus among mediation practitioners is that 75-85% is a reasonable rate of mediations that result in agreements and is consistent with national mediation success rate data. States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's 618 data, explain.

States are not required to report data at the EIS program level.

10 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.

NO

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1 Mediations held	0
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	0
SY 2020-21 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/03/2021	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	0

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR), including targets, is developed and revised with review and input from DESE staff in Part B/619, State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) members and SPOE Directors. Staff in the Early Intervention section allocate time to discuss and review content and data in the SPP/APR at SICC and SPOE Director meetings throughout the fiscal year.

At the end of each calendar year, DESE sends a draft SPP/APR document to the SICC, which includes parents of children with disabilities, early intervention providers, State agency partners, and SPOE Directors for review prior to group discussion at meetings held each January.

These groups are asked to provide feedback to staff in the Early Intervention section in order for recommendations to be considered and incorporated into the final document submitted to the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs.

See the Soliciting Public Input section of the Introduction for additional Stakeholder engagement activities conducted for this submission.

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2005	

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Target>=					
Data					

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target>=						

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
0	0	0				N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Missouri Part C did not establish baseline or targets due to having no mediation data. If in a future reporting period the number of mediations reaches 10 or greater, Missouri Part C will develop a baseline and targets.

10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

10 - OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2020. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

10 - Required Actions

Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Instructions and Measurement

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Measurement

The State's SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

Instructions

Baseline Data: The State must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families.

Targets: In its FFY 2020 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2022, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2020 through FFY 2025. The State's FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State's baseline data.

Updated Data: In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 2022 through February 2027, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families. In its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families by improving early intervention services. Stakeholders, including parents of infants and toddlers with disabilities, early intervention service (EIS) programs and providers, the State Interagency Coordinating Council, and others, are critical participants in improving results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families and must be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State's targets under Indicator 11. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

Phase I: Analysis:

- Data Analysis;
- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;
- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and their Families;
- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and
- Theory of Action.

Phase II: Plan (which is in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Infrastructure Development;
- Support for EIS Program and/or EIS Provider Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and
- Evaluation.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation (which is in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP

Refer to FFY 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and Their Families (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2020 through FFY 2025 SPP/APR, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, e.g., a logic model, of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2021). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (i.e., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (i.e., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

C. Stakeholder Engagement

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2020 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2021, i.e., July 1, 2021-June 30, 2022) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

11 - Indicator Data

Section A: Data Analysis

What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?

Of infants and toddlers entering Missouri Part C below age expectations in social-emotional skills and in regions fully implementing revised ECO procedures, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth in positive social-emotional skills by the time they exit Part C.

Note- the State did slightly modify the SiMR statement to remove language no longer applicable, such as the FFY2018 timeline and reference to the "ECO pilot" since the State has moved from a pilot project to full statewide implementation. However, the focus on social-emotional skills did not change.

Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)

NO

Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)

YES

Provide a description of the subset of the population from the indicator.

Six of the ten SPOE regions in the state are included in the SiMR data. Although additional regions have been added to the pilot, they were not included in the SiMR due to the extent of time necessary to learn new practices and small N sizes of children who entered and exited the program while the region was fully implementing the revised ECO procedures.

Is the State's theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

YES

Please provide a description of the changes and updates to the theory of action.

In March of 2021, the last two regions of the state began implementing the revised ECO procedures resulting in the state moving from a pilot project into full statewide implementation. Due to this, references to the "ECO pilot" were removed from the full implementation stage of the Theory of Action. Throughout this SSIP, references to "ECO pilot" procedures will now be identified as the "revised ECO" procedures.

Please provide a link to the current theory of action.

Missouri's theory of action, evaluation plan and sustainability plan can be found here: <https://dese.mo.gov/childhood/early-intervention/first-steps/evidence-based-practices>

Progress toward the SiMR

Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages).

Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)

NO

Historical Data

Baseline Year	Baseline Data
2013	69.10%

Targets

FFY	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Target>=	85.10%	85.10%	86.10%	86.10%	87.10%	87.10%

FFY 2020 SPP/APR Data

Infants and toddlers who substantially increased their rate of growth	Infants and toddlers who entered the program below age expectation	FFY 2019 Data	FFY 2020 Target	FFY 2020 Data	Status	Slippage
1,936	2,133	89.20%	85.10%	90.76%	Met target	No Slippage

Provide the data source for the FFY 2020 data.

Data from the following ECO pilot implementation cohorts were included in the SiMR data:

Cohort 1—One rural (Region 10) and one suburban area (Region 9). Implementation date was October 1, 2013.

Cohort 2—One urban area (Region 5). Implementation date was October 1, 2014.

Cohort 3—One rural (Region 3) and one suburban area (Region 4). Implementation date was October 1, 2016.

Cohort 4- One suburban area (Region 6). Implementation date was November 1, 2018.

Data for indicator 11 come from the states electronic data system known as WebSPOE.

Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR.

Service coordinators facilitate an ECO conversation at IFSP meetings with the parent and early intervention provider(s) that includes a focus on three sources of information (parent input, provider observations, assessment results). These sources are used in the discussion about the child's progress and current skills as well as to answer questions from the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Decision Tree and Missouri Definition of Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) Ratings document to determine a rating for each outcome area.

The IFSP team selects a rating (1-5) that best represents the child's functioning in each outcome area. After ratings are determined for each of the three outcome areas, the Service Coordinator enters the data in the child's electronic record. Required data entry includes the date of the IFSP meeting, the rating type (i.e., entry, midpoint, and exit), the IFSP meeting type and the child's rating for each outcome area.

State staff access data reports from the electronic system to calculate SiMR data. Entry and exit ratings are used to determine the "outcome" data for the SiMR. SiMR trend data is examined quarterly and compared across regions of the State with similar demographics (e.g., similar child count, geography) in order to inform the ongoing implementation of the SSIP. Any data anomalies found result in a more in depth analysis of the data. The SiMR data are compared across regions and cohorts to ensure consistency of implementation.

Optional: Has the State collected additional data (i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey) that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)

YES

Describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR.

Additional data collected and analyzed by the State include:

Child Data: As discussed in previous submissions, the state conducts additional analysis of geographic and demographic data of children represented in the SiMR data compared to Indicator 3 data. The geographic and demographic data continue to be representational of those included in the SiMR data.

ECO Data: ECO data from all ten System Point of Entry (SPOE) regions is provided to regional directors on a monthly basis and reviewed with State staff. These monthly data reviews demonstrate a continuing trend in increasing percentages in summary statement one and decreasing percentages in summary statement two. The past five years of SiMR data indicate a leveling off in the summary statement data, which is a sign that the regions implementing the revised ECO procedures are producing more accurate and consistent data on child outcomes.

Provider Survey Data: The state disseminates an annual survey to Early Intervention Team providers in the pilot regions. The survey contains at least four questions to assist in the analysis of the use of revised ECO practices and procedures (i.e., discuss outcomes at all IFSP meetings held in-person, use the Decision Tree to determine ratings, collect ratings every six months at a minimum and the IFSP team uses three sources of information to determine a rating). This year the state added a text box for providers to give a written response if they disagreed with a survey item. Overall, the results this year are comparable to previous years with most providers agreeing to the survey items; however, there has been a trend in lower agreement rates in regions newer to the revised ECO procedures. A lower agreement was expected as providers become accustomed to new practices. In regions that have been using the revised ECO procedures for several years, there were comparable responses across regions.

Family Survey Data: The state disseminates an annual survey to all parents whose children have had an active Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) for at least six months. The state analyzes responses from two questions related to child outcomes that already exist in the statewide parent survey. Those questions are 1. I feel I am an active part of the team when we meet to discuss my child (99.34% of parents agreed or strongly agreed in 2021) and 2. I am able to help my child learn new skills because of First Steps services (98.78% of parents agreed or strongly agreed in 2021).

Service Coordinator Observation Data: The state analyzes data collected from the annual SPOE needs assessment. The needs assessment produces both qualitative and quantitative data from regional SPOE Directors observations of Service Coordinators conducting IFSP meetings using the IFSP Meeting Observation Tool. The ECO discussion at IFSP meetings and rating procedures are observed and scored as a part of the tool. The results of Service Coordinator observation data from 2021 needs assessment from those SPOE regions included in the SiMR are 63 Service Coordinators observed. Of those 63 observed, most Service Coordinators were found to be fully implementing the three key ECO procedures of: discussing age appropriate skills, obtaining an ECO rating at the IFSP meeting and including three sources of information in the determination of the ECO rating. Those that did not receive all points on the observation tool tended to be newer Service Coordinators. Overall, the biggest need identified as a result of the observations was support for Service Coordinators in the discussion of age appropriate skills and parent understanding of typical development. The results of the Needs Assessment observations are discussed regularly with state staff and SPOE staff, and resource and training information is shared as it becomes available.

Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)

NO

Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

Is the State's evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)

YES

If yes, please provide the following information: a description of the changes and updates to the evaluation plan; a rationale or justification for the changes; and, a link to the State's current evaluation plan.

The evaluation plan was updated to reflect changes to the State's improvement strategies. Additionally, the format was changed from a narrative to a chart to better outline the State's plan and to better communicate the plan with stakeholders. Missouri's theory of action, evaluation plan and sustainability plan can be found here: <https://dese.mo.gov/childhood/early-intervention/first-steps/evidence-based-practices>

Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period.

In previous SSIP submissions, the state identified the ECO pilot and EITs as the two key mechanisms to improve child outcomes. To date, these two activities are in different stages of implementation. All ten regions have been implementing EIT since 2008; however, the state included the final two of ten SPOE regions in the ECO pilot in March of 2021, achieving statewide implementation of the revised ECO procedures. Developing and sustaining foundational materials to support early intervention professionals and ensuring the revised ECO procedures are being implemented with fidelity remain key improvement strategies for the State.

Sustainability of Foundational Materials

During this submission period, with the ongoing impact of the COVID-19 pandemic, the State found virtual and on demand trainings to be key. With the ability to reach Service Coordinators and providers using virtual and on-demand meetings and trainings, the State was able to deliver training on evidence-based tools as mentioned in this submission, continue to offer professional development through the online modules and meet with regional staff as needed. For sustainability, State staff continues to train regional staff on an as needed basis. Foundational materials are reviewed by the State on a regular basis for any necessary enhancements or revisions.

Early Childhood Outcomes Procedures and Related Professional Development

Expansion of the ECO pilot to statewide procedures was completed in 2021 with the final two regions of the state trained and beginning implementation of the revised ECO procedures. The state focused on virtual trainings for new Service Coordinators and providers in the pilot regions due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The state continues to develop connections between content in the online training modules and ECO professional development time.

As stated in previous submissions, to prepare for scaling up the final regions, the state focused on sustainable professional development and team structure through additional written and online materials. During the reporting period and through Preschool Development Grant Birth to Five (PDG B-5) grant activities, the state contracted with a university to conduct a comprehensive state-level scan of Missouri's child-serving programs to identify existing practices and align them to national standards. The purpose of this activity was to provide consistency in the use of evidence-based or research-based practices among early childhood programs and professionals. The state updated the Early Connections website to provide information on topics such as developmental milestones that can be used for ECO professional development time at EIT meetings.

Early Intervention Teams (EITs)

EIT's continues to be the infrastructure to leverage in order to build capacity to improve child outcomes. EITs are allowed to use time during each EIT meeting to participate in professional development time related to the three ECO areas. ECO professional development allows for 15 to 45 minutes of paid time to be used for any activities that can improve child outcomes such as:

- practices related to child outcome areas, (e.g., social-emotional development, appropriate behaviors, typical development for infants and toddlers)
- conversation on how to introduce and discuss ECO during the IFSP meeting, including the ECO Decision Tree and Definition of ECO Ratings
- review of the three ECO areas, including related developmental milestones and information on child development
- knowledge of local resources available in the community that relate to the ECO areas

In June of 2021 the state conducted small group discussions with SPOE Directors to discuss any provider issues such as shortages, recruitment efforts; the status of EIT meetings including the use of in-person and virtual meetings; and any new observations and/or issues that occurred in relationship to EIT as a result of the pandemic. Feedback from 2021 SPOE needs assessment reports indicated the need for the state to provide additional training and support to the field on the EIT model.

Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.

The rationale used to assess achievement was improvement efforts continued (i.e., progress made) on each of the identified improvement strategies despite all the challenges the lead agency faced throughout 2021. Achievement has been communicated with stakeholders during state staff monthly meetings with SPOE staff, quarterly SPOE director meetings, monthly PDG B-5 webinars and the January 2022 State Interagency Coordinating Council meeting which is open to the public.

Sustainability of Foundational Materials

In 2021, the state scaled-up the ECO pilot to statewide implementation by training the final two regions of the state on the revised the ECO procedures. As established in the Sustainability Plan for Missouri First Steps Early Intervention Professionals, the state offered virtual trainings on the ECO level one (introduction to ECO procedures) for all new providers or Service Coordinators. During this reporting period, the State made slight edits to the foundational materials (Service Coordinator Practice Manual and ECO Handbook) necessary to understand Part C. Those materials continue to be available to regional staff in a variety of formats to accommodate different learning styles and different levels of experience in early intervention.

Early Childhood Outcomes Procedures and Related Professional Development

The state adjusted the sustainability plan in 2021 to include additional information in the level one training regarding ECO professional development time during EIT meetings and to replace the ECO level two training with online module 7. Module 7 had been previously password protected, but since the state scaled up the ECO pilot in 2021 by adding the final two regions of the state into the pilot project, Module 7 was opened to be accessible to all SPOE regions and providers for targeted technical assistance and on demand use. In June of 2021, the final chapter of the state's guidance manual for Service Coordinators on Early Childhood Outcomes was finalized and presented to regional staff. This manual is posted publicly for on demand access by the field.

Through the PDG B-5 grant, the lead agency provided a series of virtual trainings on developmental milestones in 2021. The purpose of this activity was to educate professionals on typical and atypical development in young children, screening procedures, and appropriate referrals. This activity supported ECO professional development in that the IFSP team must also consider the child's functioning in comparison to age-appropriate skills in the three ECO areas: positive social-emotional skills, acquisition and use of knowledge and skills, and appropriate behaviors. When comparing a child's functioning to age-appropriate skills, the IFSP team discusses the child's current developmental milestones compared to other children of similar age. This comparison to age-appropriate skills may assist families in understanding the next step in their child's development, therefore it is important that early intervention professionals have a solid understanding of developmental milestones so that they can guide the parent through those conversations. All ten SPOE regions reported staff attending the developmental milestones training in 2021 and indicated additional training on this topic would be beneficial.

Early Intervention Teams (EITs)

While developing the Family Assessment Interview Worksheet in 2019-20, the state quickly realized how connected the family assessment process was to the creation of functional outcomes in the IFSP. The family assessment information helps formulate outcomes in the IFSP, which the primary provider assists the family in meeting those outcomes. If the primary provider needs support or the expertise of another discipline, they can reach out to EIT members for suggestions and guidance; therefore the need for training on functional outcomes was identified to address the entire process of family assessment to IFSP development. Service Coordinators were initially trained virtually in the fall of 2020 and ongoing training on family assessment to functional outcome was continued into 2021. These trainings were recorded for sustainability are a part of the State's training library and available to Service coordinators and providers as requested. The state is in the process of posting the training online for on-demand use.

Another achievement related to EIT is that due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the State removed the requirement for in person EIT meetings and allowed for virtual meetings. As a result of that, all ten SPOE regions have reported record numbers of attendance at EIT meetings. Overall, the virtual option is working well and the State is considering making virtual EIT meetings a permanent option beyond the COVID-19 operating guidance.

Did the State implement any new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)

YES

Describe each new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategy and the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved.

New Infrastructure Improvement Strategies: Office of Childhood and Professional Development System

On January 28, 2021, Missouri Governor Parson and the departments of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE), Health and Senior Services (DHSS), and Social Services (DSS) announced nearly all early childhood programs across State government will be consolidated in a single Office of Childhood (OOC) within DESE (Part C lead agency) in an effort to better align and improve the early childhood landscape in Missouri. Each State agency provided various services for children and families, including home visiting, child care, and early intervention. In partnership with other agencies that provide professional development and other supportive services (e.g., Department of Mental Health and Child Care Aware® of Missouri), Missouri has created a more coordinated early childhood system for families and professionals.

As stated in previous SSIP submissions, the state originally planned to initiate a provider coaching system. While there is still a need for a method for early intervention professionals to engage in coaching, the State does not have the current infrastructure needed to do this. Given restructuring of staff in the new Office of Childhood, the ongoing impact of the pandemic and extensive PDG B-5 grant activities in the new office, the State is proposing to move from a focus on a provider coaching system to refocusing efforts for a more robust early childhood professional development system that considers the involvement of early intervention professionals. This activity supports the installation level of the Training & Sustainability Plan for Missouri First Steps Early Intervention Professionals to support professionals learning about early intervention practices and the Initial Implementation level where professionals are participating in reflective practices.

During the reporting period, the lead agency worked on obtaining a single workforce registry and training/professional development system that can be used to help bridge the gap between the varying levels of academic and experience needed for early childhood professionals, including early intervention providers. This system provides the ability to expand workforce activities such as a professional registry and training to professionals working in home visiting and parent education programs which are an important part of the larger birth to five system.

Additionally, the lead agency developed a system design and requirements for a comprehensive early childhood professional registry. The purpose of this activity was to expand access for more professionals to be part of the registry and improve data collection on qualified personnel in Missouri's early childhood workforce, including early intervention professionals.

Finally, the lead agency contracted with a university to conduct a comprehensive State-level scan of Missouri's child-serving programs to identify existing practices and align them to national standards. The purpose of this activity was to provide consistency in the use of evidence-based or research-based practices among ECE programs and professionals. Currently, information regarding identifying child strengths from the Early Childhood Technical Assistance (ECTA) and The Circles of Evidence-Based Decision Making in Early Childhood from the National Center for Systemic Improvement (NCSI) are available online to all early childhood professionals.

Many activities under the PDG B-5 grant, once implemented, will offer ways for early intervention professionals to get connected to evidence based-practices and network with other early childhood professionals. State Part C staff are actively involved in the professional development initiatives as part of the PDG B-5 grant and intend to leverage those activities to increase access to evidence-based practices.

Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

The State's short term goals for future submissions, as identified in the evaluation plan, are to complete additional foundational materials for early intervention providers, ensure the revised ECO procedures are implemented with fidelity and provide updated training on the primary provider/teaming model. The State's intermediate goals for future submissions include increasing early intervention professionals access to high quality professional development and the creation of assessment tools to evaluate the use of evidenced-based practices for the IFSP process (including family assessment), EIT meetings and home visits.

Foundational Materials

The State's focus for the Training & Sustainability Plan for Missouri First Steps Early Intervention Professionals has been on developing the first level (exploration) in order to ensure introductory information is available to professionals in early intervention. The state currently has four guidance manual chapters for early intervention providers that need to be completed (Evaluation and Assessment, IFSP, early intervention services and home visiting practices). Finishing these chapters to ensure adequate foundational materials are available to early intervention providers is a priority for the State. Foundational materials must be in place before professionals can move to the evidenced-based practices level of the Training and Sustainability Plan. In addition, the state is continuing to focus on ensuring the foundational materials are sustainable. The foundational materials continue to be available in a variety of formats to accommodate different learning styles and different levels of experience in early intervention. Foundational materials are reviewed on a regular basis for any necessary enhancements or revisions.

Revised ECO Procedures

Next steps for the ECO pilot include transitioning from pilot status to statewide implementation, including updating all materials and communications to remove references to a current pilot project. Now that all ten regions of the State are using the same procedures to determine ECO ratings, that State will closely monitor data for the newest regions as well as those regions who have been in the pilot for years to ensure data trends continue to correlate more closely with the eligibility requirements of the program and that procedures are implemented with fidelity. Evaluating the sustainability plan for the ECO and building upon existing information and resources will be key to long term success of the ECO procedural changes made over the past eight years of the ECO pilot project. Adding additional resources on evidenced-based practices and social emotional development in young children, and the professional development improvements planned for 2022 will be critical to the State making progress towards the SiMR.

Early Intervention Teams (EITs)

Next steps for EITs include the State gathering data on the functioning of the EIT model across the state. The State will gather the data through contract monitoring, provider survey data and monthly check-ins with regional staff. Under the contract regional early intervention services, each contractor is required to conduct evaluations at a minimum annually of the functioning of the EIT for each region in the awarded service area and make adjustments accordingly (e.g. change the number of team members, identify training needs of the team members, remove First Steps providers from the team, etc.). Additionally, under the contract, each contractor shall assign ninety-five percent (95%) of all eligible children with an IFSP to an EIT. The State will research updated information from national experts on the teaming model and identify a plan to provide updated training on EIT to service coordinators and early intervention providers. The anticipated outcome is building upon existing foundational materials to elevate the teaming model across the State and workforce development activities to elevate the profession as a whole.

Additional activities related to EIT are planned with American Rescue Plan funds that are anticipated to be available in the Spring of 2022. Those activities include: reprinting brochures and other materials used for child find activities, provide additional services and EIT meetings as needed to respond to pandemic and purchase approximately ten Otoacoustic Emission (OAE) Testing machines to screen children with possible hearing loss. The State is continuing to evaluate the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the EIT model, including EIT meeting participation; service delivery trends, and any impact to families based on the shift to virtual EIT meetings during the pandemic.

Access to High Quality Professional Development

The State continues to recognize the need to build a support system for provider practices. While oversight of and support to Service Coordinators is fulfilled by the SPOE contract requirements, there continues to be a gap in support for providers. The State supports providers through guidance materials and virtual or in-person trainings, when possible. Through the PDG B-5 grant activities on workforce development, the State hopes to increase access to professional development opportunities for early intervention professionals and to allow for more networking among early intervention providers to share knowledge and expertise. The shared ECE professional registry planned for 2022 will expand the system to include home visitors (e.g., parent educators, developmental screeners and early interventionists) to improve access to consistent professional development across the State. The State will implement several contracts to develop professional development (e.g., videos, virtual training, and webinars) for ECE professionals that is based on the agreed-upon best practices, including strategies to implement the agreed-upon best practices with families.

Next steps for ECO related professional development include continuing with PDG B-5 initiatives related to professional development and early childhood workforce improvements. Based on the response for more training on developmental milestones, typical/atypical development and social/emotional development, additional virtual training sessions will be scheduled in 2022. DESE and its partners will record videos for parents and professionals on typical and atypical behaviors, including how to access information from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Additional activities related to ECO related professional development include American Rescue Plan funds earmarked to support the social emotional needs of children and families in response to the pandemic. These activities have a direct connection to the SiMR and will ensure that the State delivers professional development opportunities for early childhood professionals that are based on best practices and aligned across multiple early childhood programs.

Evaluating the Use of Evidence-Based Practices

Currently, the state has a tool in place to evaluate IFSP meeting evidenced-base practices. During the reporting period, the State did not make any changes to the current processes for evaluating the use of evidence-based practices due to needing additional foundational materials and training available to early intervention professionals before it would be reasonable to create tools to evaluate such practices. Next steps for this strategy include completing or revising necessary foundational materials to support early intervention professionals in the areas of the EIT model and EIT meetings and home visiting practices. Once the foundational materials are in place, the state can between to create additional tools to evaluate the use of evidence-based practices.

List the selected evidence-based practices implemented in the reporting period:

The evidenced-based practices implemented in the reporting period related to the SSIP were:

1. IFSP Meeting Observation Tool
2. Family Assessment Interview Worksheet

Provide a summary of each evidence-based practice.

IFSP Meeting Observation Tool

The First Steps Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) Meeting Observation Tool is designed to measure the use of Evidence-Based Practices (EBP) during IFSP Meetings. The intent of the observation tool is to examine the interactions, discussions and overall tone of the IFSP meeting, not to serve as

a script for conversations during the IFSP meeting. The tool can be used to observe Service Coordinator and Provider practices during IFSP meetings to help identify the need for targeted technical assistance and/or additional training. The tool also assists the regional SPOE Directors with the annual needs assessment. The needs assessment identifies the strengths, challenges and any related training and technical assistance in the region, based on observations of Service Coordinator activities. Observation data is submitted annually to the lead agency and included in the SSIP report.

The observation tool consists of four essential IFSP meetings practices: establish and maintain a collaborative and respectful climate, prioritize the family's concerns, determine IFSP outcomes, and prepare the family for next steps. Each essential practice identifies three or four observable components necessary to achieve the essential practice. Each observable component has three or four key indicators that specify the EBP, with examples and/or prompts in parentheses.

The First Steps IFSP Meeting Observation Tool was developed with information from the following sources:

- Agreed-Upon Practices: https://ectacenter.org/~pdfs/topics/families/AgreedUponPractices_FinalDraft2_01_08.pdf
- Key Principles: https://ectacenter.org/~pdfs/topics/families/Principles_LooksLike_DoesntLookLike3_11_08.pdf
- Division of Early Childhood-Recommended Practices (DEC-RP): <http://ectacenter.org/decrp/>
- Reaching Potentials through Recommended Practices Observation Scale –Home Visiting (RP² OS-HV): http://ectacenter.org/~pdfs/implement_ebp/RP2_OS-HV.pdf

The following individuals provided feedback and guidance during the development of this tool:

- SPOE Directors and Providers on the Program Improvement Work Group
- Sherry Franklin, Technical Assistance Specialist-The Early Childhood Technical Assistance (ECTA) Center
- Anne Lucas, Technical Assistance Specialist-The Early Childhood Technical Assistance (ECTA) Center
- Debbie Shaver, Ph.D., Evaluation Specialist-IDEA Data Center (IDC)

Family Assessment Interview Worksheet

The First Steps Family Assessment Interview Worksheet is designed to identify the family's concerns, priorities and resources by reviewing the child and family's participation and satisfaction within everyday routines, which is a critical component of a quality IFSP. The family assessment also identifies the strengths and needs of the family related to enhancing the development of the child. The Family Assessment occurs in preparation for an Initial IFSP meeting and is reviewed and updated, at minimum, prior to each Annual IFSP meeting.

The purpose of the Family Assessment is to identify the family's concerns, priorities and resources for their child and family, which may involve locating additional resources the family needs. The Family Assessment also identifies the strengths and needs of the family related to enhancing the development of the child. The Family Assessment is conducted as an interview between family members and the Service Coordinator. Although it is the Service Coordinator's responsibility to conduct the Family Assessment, the child's provider should participate in the interview too.

The First Steps Family Assessment Interview Worksheet was developed with information from the following sources:

- Jung, L. A. (2010). Identifying Families' Supports and Other Resources. In R. A. McWilliam (Ed.), *Working with Families of Young Children with Special Needs* (pp.9-26). New York: Guilford.
- McWilliam, R. A. (2010). Satisfaction with home routines evaluation (SHoRE). *Routines-Based Early Intervention: Supporting Young Children and Their Families* (pp.258). Baltimore: Brookes.

Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practices and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child/outcomes.

IFSP Meeting Observation Tool

The tool consists of four essential IFSP meetings practices: establish and maintain a collaborative and respectful climate, prioritize the family's concerns, determine IFSP outcomes and prepare the family for next steps. Each essential practice identifies three or four observable components necessary to achieve the essential practice and ensure fidelity of implementation. All SPOE regions utilize the IFSP Meeting Observation Tool as part of an effort to gather consistent data on how the IFSP process is done throughout the State. This tool impacts the SiMR by providing the field with the expectations for evidence-based practices during IFSP meetings which influences service coordinator and provider practices.

Family Assessment Interview Worksheet

The worksheet consists of three sections: explanation to family, family supports and resources and daily routines, concerns and priorities. Each section builds upon the next, and provides for an engaging conversation and comprehensive review of the family's needs and priorities. All routines marked as "priority" become the basis for the development of outcomes at the IFSP meeting. Once the interview is complete, the Service Coordinator utilizes the family assessment information to assist with the development or revision of the next IFSP. This tool impacts the SiMR by providing the field with the expectations for evidence-based practices to collect family assessment information, which influences service coordinator and provider practices, which ultimately influences parent and child outcomes.

Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.

IFSP Meeting Data

The State collected data from the annual SPOE needs assessment. The needs assessment produces both qualitative and quantitative data from SPOE administrator's observations of Service Coordinators conducting IFSP meetings using the IFSP Meeting Observation Tool. The ECO discussion at IFSP meetings and rating procedures are observed and scored as a part of the tool.

All six regions included in the SiMR for this SSIP report used the IFSP Meeting Observation Tool provided by the State. The data collected from IFSP meeting observations in pilot regions consisted of two prongs: early intervention practices and ECO practices. The State provides a report template to assist SPOE Directors in gathering and reporting these data consistently. The State continued to require IFSP Meeting Observation Tool data be included in the annual needs assessment submissions for all SPOE regions. This allows the State to compare practices of those SPOE regions that have been in the ECO pilot for many years compared to those who recently joined and determine additional training and technical assistance needs at the regional level.

Family Assessment Data

The State collected data from the annual SPOE needs assessment. The needs assessment produces both qualitative and quantitative data from SPOE

administrator's observations of Service Coordinators prioritizing the family's concerns, considering child and family assessment information. All SPOE regions utilize the Family Assessment Interview Worksheet to ensure consistent procedures and practices are implemented statewide to gather family concerns, priorities and resources which influences parent and child outcomes in the IFSP. The family assessment conversation is observed and scored as a part of the IFSP Meeting Observation tool. The State provides a report template to assist SPOE Directors in gathering and reporting these data consistently. The State uses this data to determine any additional training and technical assistance needs at the regional level.

Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.

Additional data collected that supports the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice include:

Provider Survey

The annual ECO provider survey is sent to EIT members and has questions to gather the provider perspective of ECO conversations and early intervention practices followed during IFSP meetings. The State monitors responses to these questions annually to determine any inconsistencies between provider survey responses and the observation results of Service Coordinators reported in the annual SPOE needs assessments.

Five Plans from SPOE Contract

As required in the regional contracts for service coordination services, each contractor is required to submit a work plan regarding five key areas of the early intervention system: 1) EIT, 2) Early Intervention Examiners, 3) Child Find and Public Awareness, 4) Data and 5) Needs Assessment.

While the annual needs assessment report from each of the ten SPOE regions is the State's main method of gathering qualitative and quantitative data for the SSIP, progress monitoring of each SPOE's plan for addressing issues related to EIT, Early Intervention Examiners, Child Find and Public Awareness and Data (including ECO data) is reviewed at least quarterly with State staff to determine any technical assistance or training needs related to those topics. Additionally, State staff conduct large and/or small group discussions with SPOE Directors at least annually to allow for networking and problem solving.

The progress monitoring activities above allow for ongoing oversight by the State to stay abreast of what is happening in the field and identify and resolve issues in a timely manner. Additionally, these processes allow for a continual feedback loop between the State and regional contractors and providers. A well-functioning teaming model, quality early intervention examiners to provide evaluation services, ongoing child find efforts and regular data reviews at the local and State level all contribute to the overall picture of quality early intervention services which directly impacts positive outcomes for children and families.

Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.

IFSP Meeting practices:

The State plans to continue the use of the IFSP Meeting Observation tool statewide for annual Service Coordinator observations and will research supplemental resources to support early intervention professionals with evidenced-based practices for IFSP meetings. The State is also continuing to address IFSP processes that were impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic and explore ways to make processes more accessible (e.g., virtual vs. in person activities). The State plans to release another chapter in the provider guidance manual on IFSP practices and procedures. The State will also explore ways to streamline data entry of IFSP meetings to encourage more emphasis on the discussion with the family and provider participation in meetings versus data entry and paperwork. The anticipated outcome is removing cumbersome processes for Service Coordinators to allow for an increased focus on best practice.

Family Assessment practices:

The State plans to continue the use of the Family Assessment Interview Worksheet as the State identified tool to collect family assessment information and will research supplemental resources to support Service Coordinators in engaging the family and supporting the families concerns, priorities and resources. The State also plans to release another chapter in the provider guidance manual on Evaluation and Assessment practices and procedures to support professionals understanding of the rules and best practices for evaluation and assessment in early intervention, including the family assessment. In turn, the State plans to add to the existing IFSP Meeting Observation Tool essential practices related to the family assessment to evaluate those practices in conjunction with the existing IFSP meeting practices.

Additionally, the State is continuing to evaluate the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the family assessment process, understand the barriers/challenges families and early intervention staff experienced during the pandemic and determine if changes are needed to guidance as a result. The anticipated outcome is ongoing support of the use of evidence-based practices for service coordinators and providers.

Describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in the previous submission and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The biggest change to the activities described in previous SSIPs is the State refocusing efforts from an early intervention provider coaching system to a more robust early childhood professional development system. Staff in the early intervention section at the lead agency have brainstormed various ideas over the past few years on how to initiate and sustain a coaching/mentor system, however have come across many roadblocks that have stalled and ultimately changed the State's course of implementing this concept.

While the vision for an early intervention provider coaching system remains, with the implementation of the PDG B-5 grant infrastructure activities, the State will now utilize the PDG B-5 activities consisting of creating a professional development system, workforce improvement strategies, development of best practices for early childhood professionals, and developmental milestones training as building the foundation for a future early intervention provider coaching system. Depending on the outcome of each of these activities, the State will re-assess the need for a provider coaching system specific to early intervention.

Section C: Stakeholder Engagement

Description of Stakeholder Input

The State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR), including targets, is developed and revised with review and input from DESE staff in Part B/619, State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) members and SPOE Directors. Staff in the Early Intervention section allocate time to discuss and review content and data in the SPP/APR at SICC and SPOE Director meetings throughout the fiscal year.

At the end of each calendar year, DESE sends a draft SPP/APR document to the SICC, which includes parents of children with disabilities, early intervention providers, State agency partners, and SPOE Directors for review prior to group discussion at meetings held each January.

These groups are asked to provide feedback to staff in the Early Intervention section in order for recommendations to be considered and incorporated into the final document submitted to the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs.

See the Soliciting Public Input section of the Introduction for additional Stakeholder engagement activities conducted for this submission.

Stakeholder input on the SSIP was achieved through:

Presentations to the State Interagency Coordinating Council (SICC) and Regional Councils

Quarterly SPOE Director Meetings

Virtual focus groups

Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.

SICC Meetings:

During this reporting period, State staff provided information about SSIP activities during SICC meetings in 2021, including: (1) discussion about the ECO pilot achieving statewide implementation, (2) family survey data collection and methods to increase response rates and (3) stakeholder input on proposed APR targets and (4) discussion of the creation of the new Office of Childhood and PDG B-5 grant activities impacting early intervention. Council members, including parents and staff from various State agencies and stakeholders such as staff from other State departments, were given an opportunity during each meeting to review and provide suggestions to revise SSIP activities. Additionally, some regions in the State have very active regional councils. In those areas, State staff attended regional council meetings and provided regular updates on ECO data and the status of the pilot project.

SPOE Director Meetings:

During this reporting period, State staff facilitated quarterly meetings with the ten regional SPOE Directors and their lead staff to provide updates or revisions to guidance, updates on current issues affecting the program, to get feedback from the field on any issues they are having, provide updates on current initiatives from lead agency that relate to early intervention, plan for future program needs, and review APR and other programmatic data trends.

Virtual Focus Groups:

During this reporting period, State staff facilitated three virtual focus groups to gain stakeholder input on setting targets for the APR and the improvement efforts included in the SSIP. The focus groups were advertised using a variety of methods (office newsletter distributed statewide, SPOE staff, Head Start, Missouri's Parent Training Center). From those efforts, 34 individuals signed up and 14 attended a focus group. Of those 14, individuals represented included parent/guardians of children who receive or have received early intervention services, early intervention providers, parent training center staff and Head Start representatives.

Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)

YES

Describe how the State addressed the concerns expressed by stakeholders.

Some stakeholders expressed concerns that the program could do more to support the needs of children and families. Stakeholders also expressed concerns with how child find and ECO data are collected and compared to other states for APR reporting. These concerns were addressed by providing further clarification on the state's eligibility criteria and the process for establishing such criteria which includes stakeholder input and clarification on the APR process and the measurement and reporting criteria established by OSEP.

Additional Implementation Activities

List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.

There are no additional activities related to the SiMR that the State has not already described.

Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.

N/A

Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).

11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

11 - OSEP Response

The State provided targets for FFYs 2020 through 2025 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

The State provided an explanation of how COVID-19 impacted its ability to collect FFY 2020 data for this indicator and steps the State has taken to mitigate the impact of COVID-19 on data collection.

11 - Required Actions

Certification

Instructions

Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.

Certify

I certify that I am the Director of the State's Lead Agency under Part C of the IDEA, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part C State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

Select the certifier's role

Designated Lead Agency Director

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part C State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name:

Dr. Pamela Thomas

Title:

Assistant Commissioner, Office of Childhood

Email:

Pam.Thomas@dese.mo.gov

Phone:

5737517604

Submitted on:

04/25/22 11:20:35 PM